

The Philanthropist.

JAMES G. BIRNEY,

We are verily guilty concerning our brother *** therefore, in this distress come upon us.

EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

VOLUME I.

NEW RICHMOND, OHIO, FRIDAY, MARCH 4, 1836.

NUMBER 10.

THE PHILANTHROPIST

IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY AT

NEW RICHMOND, CLERMONT CO., OHIO.

TERMS.

Two Dollars per annum, always payable in ADVANCE. All Letters and Communications must be post-paid—and should be directed to the Editor of the Philanthropist. Names of the Counties particularly should be mentioned in directing where papers are to be sent. An Advertisement making one square or a space of equal length and breadth, will be inserted three times for One Dollar.

SLAVE-HOLDER'S DEPARTMENT.

Calhoun's Report, in the Senate, Feb. 4, 1836.

Mr CALHOUN made the following report:

The SELECT COMMITTEE to whom was referred that portion of the President's Message which relates to the attempt to circulate, through the mail, inflammatory appeals, to excite the slaves to insurrection, submitted the following report—

The committee fully concur with the president, as to the character and tendency of the papers which have been attempted to be circulated in the south, through the mail, and participate with him, in the indignant regret which he expresses, at conduct so destructive of the peace and harmony of the country, and so repugnant to the constitution and the dictates of humanity and religion. They also concur in the hope, that if the strong tone of disapprobation which these unconstitutional and wicked attempts have called forth, does not arrest them, the non-slaveholding states will be prompt to exercise their power to suppress them, as far as their authority extends. But, while they agree with the president as to the evil, and its highly dangerous tendency, and the necessity of arresting it, they have not been able to assent to the measure of redress which he recommends—that Congress should pass a law, prohibiting, under severe penalty, the transmission of incendiary publications, through the mail, intended to instigate the slaves to insurrection.

After the most careful and deliberate investigation, they have been constrained to adopt the conclusion, that Congress has not the power to pass such a law; that it would be in violation of one of the most sacred provisions of the constitution, and subversive of reserved powers, essential to the preservation of the domestic institutions of the slaveholding states, and with them their peace and security. Concurring, as they do, with the president, in the magnitude of the evil, and the necessity of its suppression, it would have been the cause of deep regret to the committee, if they thought the difference of opinion, as to the right of Congress, would deprive the slaveholding states of any portion of the protection which the measure recommended by the president was intended to afford them. On the contrary, they believe all the protection intended may be afforded, according to the views they take of the power of Congress, without infringing on any provision of the constitution on one side, or the reserved rights of the states on the other.

The committee, with these preliminary remarks, will now proceed to establish the positions which they have assumed, beginning with the first—that the passage of a law would be a violation of an express provision of the constitution.

In the discussion of this point, the committee do not deem it necessary to enquire whether the right to pass such a law can be derived from the power to establish post-offices and post-roads, or from the trust of "preserving the relation created by the constitution between the states," as supposed by the president. However ingenious or plausible the arguments may be, by which it may be attempted to derive the right from these, or any other sources, they must fall short of their object. The jealous spirit of liberty which characterized our ancestors, at the period when the constitution was adopted, forever closed the door by which the right might be implied from any of the granted powers, or any other source, if there be any other. The committee refer to the amended article of the constitution, which, among other things, provides that Congress shall pass no law which shall abridge the liberty of the press—a provision which interposes, as will be hereafter shown, an insuperable objection to the measure recommended by the president. That the true meaning of this provision may be fully comprehended, as bearing on the point under consideration, it will be necessary to recur briefly to the history of the adoption of the constitution.

It is well known that great opposition was made to the adoption of the constitution. It was acknowledged, on all hands, at the time, that the old confederation, from its weakness, had failed, and that something must be done to save the country from anarchy and convulsion; yet, so high was the spirit of liberty, so jealous were our ancestors of that day of power, that the utmost efforts were necessary, under all the then existing pressure, to obtain the assent of the states to the ratification of the constitution. Among the many objections to its adoption, none were more successfully urged than the absence of those general provisions which experience had shown to be necessary to guard the outworks of liberty; such as the freedom of the press and of speech, the rights of conscience, of trial by jury, and others of like character. It was the belief of those jealous and watchful guardians of liberty, who viewed the adoption of the constitution with so much apprehension, that all these sacred barriers without some positive provision to protect them, would, by the power of construction, be undermined and prostrated. So strong was this apprehension, that it was impossible to obtain a ratification of the instrument in many of the states, without accompanying it with the recommendation to incorporate in the constitution various articles, as amendments, intended to remove this defect, and guard against the danger apprehended, by placing these important rights beyond the possible encroachment of Congress. One of the most important of these is that which stands at the head of the list of amended articles, and which, among other things, as has been stated, prohibits the passage of any law abridging the freedom of the press, and which left that important barrier against power under the exclusive authority and control of the states.

That it was the object of this provision to place the freedom of the press beyond the possible interference of Congress, is a doctrine not now advanced for the first time. It is the ground taken, and so ably sustained, by Mr. Madison, in his celebrated report to the Virginia legislature, in 1799, against the alien and sedition law, and which conclusively settled the principle that Congress has no right, in any form or in any manner, to interfere with the freedom of the press.* The establishment of this

principle not only overthrew the sedition act, but was the leading cause of the great political revolution which, in 1801, brought the republican party, with Mr. Jefferson at its head, into power.

With these remarks, the committee will turn to the sedition act, in order to show the identity in principle between it and the act which the message recommends to be passed, as far as it relates to the freedom of the press. Among its other provisions, it inflicted punishment on all persons who should publish any false, scandalous, or malicious writing against the government, with intent to defame the same, or bring it into contempt or disrepute. Assuming this provision to be unconstitutional, as abridging the freedom of the press, which no one now doubts, it will not be difficult to show that, if instead of inflicting punishment for publishing, the act had inflicted punishment for circulating, through the mail, for the same offence, it would have been equally unconstitutional.

The one would have abridged the freedom of the press as effectually as the other. The object of publishing is circulation; and to prohibit circulation is, in effect, to prohibit publication. They both have a common object—the communication of sentiments and opinions to the public; and the prohibition of one may as effectually suppress such communication as the prohibition of the other, and, of course, would as effectually interfere with the freedom of the press, and be equally unconstitutional.

But, to understand more fully the extent of the control which the right of prohibiting circulation through the mail would give to the government of the press, it must be borne in mind that the power of Congress over the post-office and the mail is an exclusive power. It must also be remembered that Congress, in the exercise of this power, may declare any road or navigable water to be a post-road; and that, by the act of 1835, it is provided "that no stage, or other vehicle, that regularly performs trips on a post road, or on a road parallel to it, shall carry letters." The same provision extends to packets, boats, or other vessels on navigable waters. Like provision may be extended to newspapers and pamphlets; which, if it be admitted that Congress has a right to discriminate, in reference to their character, what papers shall or what shall not be transmitted by mail, would subject the freedom of the press, on all subjects, political, moral, and religious, completely to its will and pleasure. It would, in fact, in some respects, more effectually control the freedom of the press than any sedition law, however severe its penalties.

The mandate of the government alone would be sufficient to close the door against circulation through the mail, and thus, at its sole will and pleasure, might intercept all communication between the press and the people; while it would require the intervention of courts and juries to enforce the provisions of a sedition law, which experience has shown are not always passive and willing instruments in the hands of government, where the freedom of the press is concerned.

From these remarks, it must be apparent that to prohibit publication on one side, and circulation through the mail on the other, of any paper, on account of its religious, moral, or political character, rests on the same principle, and that each is equally an abridgement of the freedom of the press, and a violation of the constitution. It would indeed have been but a poor triumph for the cause of liberty, in the great contest of 1799, had the sedition law been put down on principles that would have left Congress free to suppress the circulation, through the mail, of the very publications which that edict was intended to prohibit. The authors of that memorable achievement would have had but slender claims on the gratitude of posterity, if their victory over the encroachment of power had been left so impotent.

It will, after what has been said, require but few remarks to show that the same principle which applied to the sedition law would apply equally to a law punishing, by Congress, such incendiary publications as are referred to in the message, and, of course, to the passage of a law prohibiting their transmission through the mail. The principle on which the sedition act was condemned as unconstitutional was a general one, and not limited in its application to that act. It withdraws from Congress all right of interference with the press, in any form or shape whatever; and the sedition law was put down as unconstitutional, not because it prohibited publications against the government, but because it interfered, at all, with the press. The prohibition of any publication, on the ground of its being immoral, irreligious, or intended to excite rebellion or insurrection, would have been equally unconstitutional; and, from parity of reason, the suppression of their circulation through the mail would be no less so.

But, as conclusive as these reasons are against the right, there are others no less so, derived from the powers reserved to the states, which the committee will next proceed to consider.

The message, as has been stated, recommends that Congress should pass a law to punish the transmission, through the mail, of incendiary publications, intended to instigate the slaves to insurrection. It, of course, assumes for Congress a right to determine what papers are incendiary and intended to excite insurrection. The question, then, is, has Congress such a right?—a question of vital importance to the slaveholding states, as will appear in the course of the discussion.

After examining this question with due deliberation, in all its bearings, the committee are of opinion, not only that Congress has not the right, but to admit it would be fatal to those states. Nothing is more clear than that the admission of the right, on the part of Congress, to determine what papers are incendiary, and, as such, to prohibit their circulation through the mail, necessarily involves the right to determine what are not incendiary, and to enforce their circulation. Nor is it less certain that to admit such a right would be virtually to clothe Congress with the power to abolish slavery, by giving it the means of breaking down all the barriers which the slaveholding states have erected for the protection of their lives and property. It would give Congress, without regard to the prohibition laws of the states, the authority to open the gates to the flood of incendiary publications which are ready to break into those states, and to punish all who dare resist, as criminals. Fortunately, Congress has no such right. The internal peace and security of the states are under the protection of the states themselves, to the entire exclusion of all authority and control on the part of Congress. It belongs to them, and not to Congress, to determine what is, or is not, calculated to disturb their peace and security; and of course, in the case under consideration, it belongs to the slaveholding states to determine what is incendiary and intended to incite to insurrection, and to adopt such defensive measures as may be necessary.

prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

*The article is in the following words: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or

sary for their security, with unlimited means of carrying them into effect, except such as may be expressly exhibited to the states by the constitution. To establish the truth of this position, so essential to the safety of those states, it would seem sufficient to appeal to their constant exercise of this right, at all times, without restriction or question, both before and since the adoption of the constitution. But, on a point of so much importance, which may involve their safety, if not the existence itself, of an entire section of the union, it will be proper to trace it to its origin, in order to place it on a more immoveable foundation.

The states which form our federal union are sovereign and independent communities, bound together by a constitutional compact, and are possessed of all the powers belonging to distinct and separate states, excepting such as are delegated to be exercised by the general government, as assumed by the compact itself expressly provides that all powers not delegated are reserved to the states and the people. To ascertain, then, whether the power in question is delegated or reserved, it is only necessary to ascertain whether it is to be found among the enumerated powers or not. If it is not among them, it belongs, of course, to the reserved powers. On turning to the constitution, it will be seen that, while the power of defending the country against external danger is found among the enumerated, the instrument is wholly silent as to the power of defending the internal peace and security of the states, and, of course, reserves to the states this important power, as it stood before the adoption of the constitution, with no other limitations, as has been stated, except such as are expressly prescribed by the instrument itself. From what has been stated, it may be inferred that the right of a state to defend itself against internal dangers is a part of the great, primary, and inherent right of self-defence, which, by the laws of nature, belongs to all communities; and so jealous were the states of this essential right, without which their independence could not be preserved, that it is expressly provided by the constitution* that the general government shall not assist a state, even in case of domestic violence, except on the application of the authorities of the state itself: thus excluding, by a necessary consequence, its interference in all other cases.

Having now shown that it belongs to the slaveholding states, whose institutions are in danger, and not to Congress, as is supposed by the message, to determine what papers are incendiary, and intended to excite insurrection among the slaves, it remains to enquire, in the next place, what are the corresponding duties of the general government, and the other states, from within whose limits and jurisdiction their institutions are attacked—a subject intimately connected with that with which the committee are immediately charged, and which, at the present juncture, ought to be fully understood by all the parties. The committee will begin with the first.

It may not be entirely useless to premise that rights and duties are reciprocal, the existence of a right always implying the corresponding duty. If, consequently, the right to protect her internal peace and security, belongs to a state, the general government is bound to respect the measures adopted by her for that purpose, and to co-operate in their execution, as far as its delegated powers may admit, or the measure may require. Thus, in the present case, the slaveholding states having the unquestionable right to pass all such laws as may be necessary to maintain the existing relation between master and slave, in those states, their right, *of course*, to prohibit the circulation of any publication, or any intercourse calculated to disturb or destroy that relation, is incontrovertible. In the execution of measures, which may be adopted by the states for this purpose, the powers of Congress over the mail, and of regulating commerce with foreign nations, and between the states, may require co-operation on the part of the general government; and it is bound, in conformity to the principle established, to respect the laws of the states in their exercise, and so to modify its acts as not only not to violate those of the states, but, as far as practicable, to co-operate in their execution. The practice of the government has been in conformity to these views.

By the act of the 25th of February, 1803, entitled "an act to prevent the importation of certain persons into certain states," where, by the laws of those states, their importation is prohibited, masters or captains of ships or vessels are forbidden, under severe penalty, "to import or bring, or cause to be imported or brought, any negro, or mulatto, or person of color, not being a native, or citizen, or registered seaman of the United States, or seaman having any port or place which shall be situated in any state which, by law, or prohibition, or shall prohibit, the admission or importation of such negro, mulatto, or other person of co' or." This provision speaks for itself, and requires no illustration. It is a case in point, and fully embraces the principle laid down. To the same effect is the act of 25th of February, 1799, respecting quarantine and health laws, which, as belonging to the internal police of the states, stand on the same ground. The act, among other things, "directs the collectors, and all other revenue officers, the masters and crew of the revenue cutters, and the military officers in command on the station, to co-operate faithfully in the execution of the quarantine and other restrictions, which health laws of the state may establish."

The principles embraced by these acts, in relation to the commercial intercourse of the country, are equally applicable to the intercourse by mail. They may, indeed, be more difficult in co-operation with the states in the latter, than in the former, but that cannot possibly affect the principle. Regarding it, then, as established both by reason and precedents, the committee, in conformity with it, have prepared a bill, and directed their chairman to report the same to the Senate, prohibiting, under the penalty of fine and imprisonment from office, any deputy post-master, in any state, territory, or district, from knowingly receiving and putting into the mail, any letter, packet, pamphlet, paper, or pictorial representation, directed to any post-office, or person in a state, territory, or district, by the laws of which the circulation of the same is forbidden; and also prohibiting, under a like penalty, any deputy post-master in said state, territory, or district, from knowingly delivering the same, except to such persons as may be authorized to receive them by the civil authority of said state, territory, or district.

It remains next to enquire into the duty of the states from within whose limits and jurisdiction the internal peace and security of the slaveholding states are endangered.

In order to comprehend more fully the nature and extent of their duty, it will be necessary to make a few remarks on the relations which exist between the states of the federal union, with the rights and obligations reciprocally resulting from such relations.

*See fourth article, fourth section, of the constitution.

It has already been stated that the states which compose our federal union are sovereign and independent communities, united by a constitutional compact. Among its members the laws of nations are in full force and obligation, except as altered or modified by the compact; and of course, the states possess, with that exception, all the rights, and are subject to all the duties, which separate and distinct communities possess, or to which they are subject. Among these are comprehended the obligation which all states are under to prevent their citizens from disturbing the peace or endangering the security of other states; and, in case of being disturbed or endangered, the right of the latter to demand of the former to adopt such measures as will prevent their recurrence, and, if refused or neglected, to resort to such measures as its protection may require. This right remains, of course, in force among the states of this union, with such limitations as are imposed expressly by the constitution. Within their limits, the rights of the slaveholding states are as full to demand of the states within whose limits and jurisdiction their peace is assailed, to adopt measures necessary to prevent the same, and, if refused or neglected, to resort to means to protect themselves, as if they were separate and independent communities.

Those states, on the other hand, are not only under all the obligations which independent communities would be to adopt such measures, but also under the obligation which the constitution superadds, rendered more sacred, if possible, by the fact, that while the union imposes restrictions on the right of the slaveholding states to defend themselves, it affords the medium through which their peace and security are assailed. It is not the intention of the committee to enquire what those restrictions are, and what are the means, which, under the constitution, are left to the slaveholding states to protect themselves. The period has not yet come, and they trust never will, when it may be necessary to decide those questions; but, come it must, unless the states whose duty it is to suppress the danger shall see in time its magnitude, and the obligations which they are under to adopt speedy and effectual measures to arrest its further progress. That the full force of this obligation may be understood by all parties, the committee propose, in conclusion, to touch briefly on the movements of the abolitionists, with the view of showing the dangerous consequences to which they must lead if not arrested.

Their professed object is the emancipation of slaves in the southern states, which they propose to accomplish through the agency of organized societies, spread throughout the non-slaveholding states, and a powerful press, directed mainly to excite the bitterest animosity and hatred of the people of the non-slaveholding states against the slaveholding institutions of the slaveholding states. It is easy to see what disastrous results such means must tend. Passing over the more obvious effects, their tendency to excite to insurrection and servile war, with all its horrors, and the necessity which such tendency must impose on the slaveholding states to resort to the most rigid discipline and severe police, to the great injury of the present condition of the slaves,—there remains another threatening incalculable mischief to the country.

The inevitable tendency of the means to which the abolitionists have resorted to effect their object, must, if persisted in, end in completely alienating the two great sections of the union. The incessant action of hundreds of societies, and a vast printing establishment, throwing out daily its thousands of artful and inflammatory publications, must make, in time, a deep impression on the section of the union where they freely circulate, and are mainly designed to have effect. The well-informed and thoughtful may hold them in contempt, but the young, the inexperienced, the ignorant, and the thoughtless, will receive the poison. In process of time, when the number of proselytes is sufficiently multiplied, the artful and profligate, who are on the watch to seize on any means, however wicked and dangerous, will unite with the fanatics, and make their movements the basis of a powerful political party, that will seek advancement by diffusing, as widely as possible, hatred against the slaveholding states. But, as hatred begets hatred, and animosity animosity, these feelings would become reciprocal, till every vestige of attachment would cease to exist between the two sections,—when the union and the constitution, the offspring of mutual affection and confidence, would forever perish.

Such is the danger to which the movements of the abolitionists expose the country. If the force of the obligation is in proportion to the magnitude of the danger, stronger cannot be imposed, than is at present, on the states within whose limits the danger originates, to arrest its further progress—a duty they owe, not only to the states whose institutions are assailed, but to the union and constitution, as has been shown, and, it may be added, to themselves. The sober and considerate portions of citizens of the non-slaveholding states, who have a deep stake in the existing institutions of the country, would have little forecast not to see that the abolitionists of the southern states may be very easily directed against those which uphold their own property and security. A very slight modification of the arguments used against the institutions which sustain the property and security of the south, would make them equally effectual against the institutions of the north, including banking, in which so vast an amount of its property and capital is invested. It would be well for those interested to reflect whether there now exists, or ever has existed, a wealthy and civilized community, in which one portion did not live on the labor of another; and whether the form in which slavery exists in the south, is not but one modification of this universal condition; and, finally, whether any other, under all the circumstances of the case, is more defensible, or stands on stronger grounds of necessity. It is time to look these questions in the face.—Let those who are interested remember that labor is the only source of wealth, and how small a portion of it, in all old and civilized countries, even the best governed, is left to those by whose labor wealth is created. Let them also reflect how little volition or agency the operatives of any country have in the question of its distribution—as little, with a few exceptions, as the African of the slaveholding states has in the distribution of the proceeds of his labor. Nor is it less oppressive, that in the one case it is effected by the stern and powerful will of the government, and in the other by the more feeble and flexible will of a master. If one be an evil, so is the other. The only difference is the amount and mode of exaction and distribution, and the agency by which they are effected.

A bill, prohibiting deputy post-masters from regularly transmitting through the mail, to any state, territory, or district, certain papers therein mentioned, the circulation of which, by the laws of said state, territory, or district, may be prohibited, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, that it shall not be lawful for any deputy post-master, in any state, territory, or district, knowingly receive and put into the mail, any pamphlet, newspaper, hand-bill, or other papers, printed or written, or pictorial representation, touching the subject of slavery, addressed to any person or post-office, in any state, territory, or district, where, by the laws of said state, territory, or district, their circulation is prohibited. Nor shall it be lawful for any deputy-post-master, in said state, territory, or district, knowingly to deliver to any person any such pamphlet, newspaper, hand-bill, or other paper, printed or written, or pictorial representation, to any person whatever, except to such person or persons, as are duly authorized, by the proper authority of such state, territory, or district, to receive the same.

Sec. 2. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that it shall be the duty of the post-master-general, to dismiss from office, any deputy-post-master offending in the premises, and such deputy-post-master shall, on conviction thereof, in any court having competent jurisdiction, be fined in any sum not less than—dollars, and not more than—dollars, according to the aggravation of the offence, at the discretion of the court.

Sec. 3. And be it further enacted, by the authority aforesaid, that it shall be the duty of deputy-post-masters, mail-carriers and other officers, and agents of the post-office department, to co-operate, as far as may be, to prevent the circulation of any pamphlet, newspaper, hand-bill, or other paper, printed or written, or pictorial representation, as aforesaid, in any state, territory, or district, where, by the laws of said state, territory, or district, the same are prohibited, and that nothing in the acts of Congress to establish and regulate the post-office department, shall be construed to protect any deputy-post-master, mail-carrier, or other officer of said department, convicted of knowingly circulating in any state, territory, or district, as aforesaid, any such pamphlet, newspaper, hand-bill, or other paper, printed or written, or pictorial representation, forbidden by the laws of such state, territory, or district.

Sec. 4. And be it further enacted, that it shall be the duty of the post-master-general, to furnish to the deputy-post-masters and their agents and officers, at the department, copies of the laws of the several states, territories, and districts, prohibiting the publication or circulation of any pamphlet, newspaper, hand-bill, or other paper, printed or written, or pictorial representation, within the limits of said states, territories, or districts, for their government in the premises; and make such regulations, and give such instructions in carrying this act into effect, as may not be made contrary to law.

Sec. 5. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that the deputy-post-masters of the offices where the pamphlets, newspapers, hand-bills, or other papers, printed or written, or pictorial representations aforesaid may be deposited, shall, under the instructions of the post-master general, from time to time, give notice of the same, so that they may be withdrawn by the person depositing them; and if not withdrawn in the space of one month thereafter, shall be burnt, or otherwise destroyed.

THE PHILANTHROPIST.

COMMUNICATIONS.

To the Officers of the Anti-Abolition Meeting.

GENTLEMEN:—According to a previous intimation given to the editor of the Philanthropist, I proceed to examine the reported doings of the Anti-Abolition Meeting, recently held in your city. Though, as the organs of that body, you have, by the language used, and the manner of treating the subject which called it together, forfeited all claim to be regarded as high minded or candid opponents; yet it is hoped that I shall not evince the same spirit. My principles forbid me to render “railing for railing.” Whatever severity or harshness may appear in this, or any subsequent communication, must be accounted for on the score, that some of the sentiments maintained by you on that occasion, demand severity of rebuke.

The way in which the meeting was first suggested, as connected with subsequent developments, is surprising; and calculated to convey the idea, that besides the ostensible object, there was a latent one which cannot be justified by “law abiding men.” If I mistake not, the first notice of a meeting was given in the Cincinnati Whig of Jan. 16, in the following words:—“It will be seen by the Cincinnati Gazette of the 15th inst., that an attempt is making by James G. Birney and his deluded followers, to create an excitement in this city, on the subject of slavery. In order to the protection of our property, &c., would it not be well that a meeting of our citizens be called to take the matter into consideration?” Now what can the meaning of such an advertisement be? “The avowed object of the suggestion, is the protection of our property.” Whoever believed that the discussion of slavery would have a tendency to the destruction of property in Cincinnati? Or is the gentleman of the Whig, and his anonymous correspondent, practising slavery in despite of the constitution and laws of Ohio? That is the only kind of property, whose tenure can by any possible construction, be endangered by such discussions. The above notice implies very strongly that anti-slavery men are in the habit of injuring their neighbors’ substance. Where have they ever been known to put forth their hands, to pull down churches, and private dwellings; or to glut their avarice by robbing others? Or is it intended, that unless something be done, to suppress their sentiments, the slaveholders, on the other side of the river, will make an onset upon the city, and wrap it in flames? I am not one of those who believe that the south will make war upon the north, because of the agitation of this subject. The lawless among them may attack some of our citizens, as they travel through that region. But all that frothy vapouring exhibited by southern politicians, and heady appeals to the cupidity of the free states, are not the harbingers of war; but are intended to intimidate abolitionists from their purpose, and enlist commercial men, and office-seekers in their cause. No man in his senses, ever thought it necessary to call a meeting to guard his property against the attacks of abolitionists, or the tendency of the discussion, in Cincinnati. Wherever attacks have been made upon public or private property, in consequence of the agitation of the subject, they have been made upon the abolitionists. No, gentleman, you have nothing to fear from such attacks; for it has ever been known that men have desolated their own estates by means of mobs? Therefore, the avowed object as stated above, is not the true one, and we must search for another. This view of the subject is confirmed, by the fact, that no measures for “the protection of property” were adopted by the meeting. The latent object, and I suppose the true one, is contained under the “&c.” What this object is, it is difficult to determine, disconnected with subsequent events. When contrasted with some things, which made their appearance during the meeting, is it not clear that an attack

upon the property of abolitionists, and their dearest rights was premeditated? That this was intended by the correspondent of the Whig, I have no doubt. And it seems you were fully aware of this contemplated violence, as is evident from the following extracts.

“The speaker (Mr. Lytle,) then showed that abolitionists ought not to be tolerated.” “Mr. Hale here rose, and contended with great earnestness that the names should be read. He wished to have the public to know, who the abolitionists were.” Now, why have the names of individuals read in a public meeting, professedly assembled to express an opinion of sentiments, and not to hold men up to reproach? When you recur to the publication in the Whig, and then consider the spirit manifested by a large part of the meeting, was not the object to be gained in reading the names, that their property might be the more easily pointed out to an infuriated mob? What else could have been designed? I am unable to see any other just conclusion to which a reader of these proceedings can arrive. Judge Wright rose again, and said, “he hoped that when the resolutions were passed, all would retire to their homes as good citizens. It has been the praise of Cincinnati, that no tumults like those in other cities have occurred. While careful for the lives and property of our friends at the south, let us not forget the rights of our fellow-citizens at home.” Such suggestions were egregiously out of place, if the speaker had believed, that all present were “law abiding men.” To a meeting composed entirely of such men, they would be an insult; and nothing but an understanding of the state of things, could ever have brought them to Judge Wright’s mind. The chairman evidently felt the incongruity of broaching such suggestions to an assembly who were all “law abiding men.” “The chairman rose and said he thanked Judge Wright for his suggestions, but they were hardly necessary.” There must have been in the opinion of the mayor (chairman,) a great and favorable change in the popular sentiment of the city, since the time he came to the editor of the Philanthropist and dissuaded him from the exercise of his constitutional rights to “print and speak,”—alleging such a reason, that their use would at once raise a mob that would be altogether uncontrollable. To peaceful men they were not necessary. Yet somehow, they appeared necessary to Judge Wright; and what could have created the necessity, but an understanding of the state of feeling, and the confusion, and disorder in the house? It is not my intention to implicate all the men who attended that meeting. But, that purposes of violence were contemplated, seems to me, indisputable. As regards the article from the Whig, I am not unsupported in my conclusions. There is a higher authority, and authority that will have its weight with you. Hear the editor of the Gazette. “The suggestion in the Whig article, that in order to the protection of our property, a public meeting may be necessary, is of an equally ominous and odious character. None can apprehend danger to ‘our property’ from the Anti-Slavery Society as it exists in this vicinity. From whom then is this danger to be apprehended? Surely it is not intended to suggest a lawless attack upon the property of anti-slavery men? And yet this seems to be the only obvious interpretation of the publication.” The same conclusion to which I have come, in relation to the Whig and his correspondent, is, that I trust that able editors mind also. And he pronounces it “the only obvious interpretation.”

And you, Gentlemen, contemplated an attack upon their right to freedom of speech and of the press; as is evident from the following: One of you, (Mr. Lytle) contended that, “abolitionists ought not to be tolerated.” What is this—the accompanying circumstances considered—but a declaration, that they should be deprived of their rights as citizens? And how different from the sentiments, that even “error of opinion may be safely tolerated, where reason is left free to combat it.” Again you say, “We will join in recommending the prompt and efficient legislation of this state, in conjunction with the other members of the confederacy, to arrest their designs. This meeting will exert every lawful effort to suppress the publication of any abolition paper in this city, or neighborhood.” What power has the legislature of this state to abridge their right to freedom of speech, and of the press? Is not their right in this respect as clearly defended by the constitution as your own? And yet you threaten to call in its powers to assist you in your crusade against them? And what “lawful effort” can you use? You can attempt to write down such a publication, or in public debate, you can attempt to argue the sentiments out of your city, if you feel yourself able for the combat. But what other lawful effort can you use? True, you can excite and stimulate the “baser sort,” to demolish such an establishment; but how will it look for law abiding men to be engaged in such nefarious business? And even then you would have to be careful, lest a more potent enemy should spring out of its ashes. The word “suppress” is incompatible with “lawful efforts,” and is somewhat ominous. Surely you did not take time sufficient, to consider such a declaration, couched in such language, before you published it to the world. What would you say if abolitionists, in public meetings, should declare, they would use every “lawful effort,” to suppress the publication of the Cincinnati Whig or Gazette? You would immediately enquire what “lawful effort” can you use? Be not surprised then, if they should smile at your feeble menaces. If they have anything to fear, is it the unlawful efforts of their opposers. These seem to those who use them, doubtless, the most effectual—and considering the peace and honor of the country, are most to be dreaded—yet even they, as well as “lawful efforts,” will be found insufficient to arrest the cause.

It is susceptible of demonstration, that they have as much right to publish their sentiments from the press, as the above named editors have theirs. But should it be admitted, that you have a right to exercise exclusive dictatorship, to the people within the city, and to establish a censorship of the press within its limits, what right have you to extend these powers over the people of the country? And will you not be guilty of meddling with domestic arrangements? You need not be astonished if such aristocratic swaggering, as you have evinced on this subject, should be held in utter abhorrence by the honest yeomenry of the country. And be assured its only tendency is to sink the men, and their cause who attempt it; and to advance the interests of those whom you now pretend to condemn.

A VOICE FROM THE COUNTRY

DR. JAMES ANDERSON says, “The labor of a West India slave costs about three as much as it would cost if executed by a free man.”

THE PHILANTHROPIST.

NEW RICHMOND, OHIO, MARCH 4, 1836.

The Cincinnati Preamble and Resolutions.

NUMBER III.

To JOHN C. WRIGHT, ESQ.—

In my remarks, last week, I endeavored to bring into prominence these truths:—

1. That the right to publish opinions—of which speaking, writing, and printing, are but modes—is a natural right—derived from our Creator—belonging to us as men—of which no human authority can justly deprive us.

2. That, the wrongs growing out of the abuse of this right were to be restrained, as other wrongs,—by the certainty of punishment—but, that the right to publish opinions was not to be subjected to any previous restraint, from fear that it might become a wrong, any more than other unquestionable rights. An illustration was found in the right to use our legs for locomotion—it would be absurd to tie them to-day, lest in the use of my right to move about at pleasure, they might carry me to-morrow into my neighbor’s field to tread down his herbage.

3. That the constitution of the United States does not by any express provision “acknowledge” the right of southern slaveholders to enslave their colored brethren, any more than that it acknowledges the right of a foreign despot, with whom our government may have intercourse, to oppress his subjects—or of the Russian nobility to make slaves of their fellow-men.

4. That no “effort” against the freedom of the press and of speech can be “lawful”—that it is actually a contradiction in terms.

5. That in your resolutions you condemn abolitionists—not for investigating the subject of southern slavery, but for not arriving at the same conclusions in relation to it that you have.

That we may keep in view, with all necessary exactness, the subject of the following comments, let us recall the words of the resolution.

“That this meeting will exert every lawful effort to suppress the publication of any abolition paper in this city or neighborhood. And, that they advise, in a spirit of frankness, such as may be concerned in a project of this description, to abandon the attempt.”

Now, sir, allowing to the abolition meeting all the respectability and intelligence”—aye, and religion, too, which its busy heralds claim for it, and which we will not stop to deny amount to an entire sufficiency for the highest purposes of legislation;—allowing them, I say, all this, and, besides, the unquestionable right to enact such an ordinance, and to command all the good people of Cincinnati to observe it with the most faithful obedience,

—from what source do you derive the authority to exercise jurisdiction over “the neighborhood?”

Did the neighboring towns assent, in any way, to such an extension of your power? The call was for “a meeting of the citizens of Cincinnati”—signed exclusively, we believe, by citizens. Was there, then, any county or “neighborhood” representative, present at the meeting, by whom you were authorized, in the name of those whom he represented, to extend your friendly and vigilant supervision over their portion of the public press? If so, sir, let his name and the extent of his commission be known. If not—you have fallen into a most shameful and barefaced violation of your own principles—for whilst you are condemning abolitionists for meddling with what belongs, exclusively, to other people, you yourselves, in taking charge, without any authority, of the concerns of the “neighborhood” are guilty of the same trespass and indecorum.

But it may be easily accounted for: zeal, without knowledge, especially in a cause radically and incurably bad, has manifold delinquencies, under the name of over-sights, to be excused. And, surely, yours has been of no ordinary heat; for, so far as I have knowledge of the doings of the pro-slavery aristocratic assemblies, held, during the last six months, in several of our eastern cities, to take into consideration the propriety of surrendering the outposts of liberty into the hands of their slaveholding assailants, they have been far surpassed by the “great anti-abolition meeting in Cincinnati.” If favor is to be won by the most humble subservience, surely you and your coadjutors can expect no small share of it from your southern friends. For, do but review for a moment what you have essayed—just look at the sum of your most obsequious undertakings:—

First—you pledge yourselves to make war (“lawful,” of course) on the constitutional right possessed by every man in Ohio, “to speak, print, and write, on any subject as he pleases.” Second—you promise to bar free discussion on the very subject of all others now most interesting to the public mind, and, of course, most calling for discussion, out of your “houses”—your “counting-rooms”—your “workshops.” Third—you take under your care a large body of your immediate fellow-citizens, who had no hand in your meeting, who repudiate with utter abhorrence the principles promulgated there, and reject with scorn the domestic inquisition to which you are striving to subject them. And, fourthly,—not content with an ordinary measure of humiliation before your southern dictators—with such as other cities have thought would be sufficient to satisfy reasonable taskmasters—you have, as it were, in the very wantonness of subserviency, unstriped all precedent, and achieved for yourselves the most enviable distinction among the submissive, when you pledge yourselves to extend your regards, unasked, to the town of Richmon—*that it, too, might be pressed into the ranks of “respectability and intelligence”* so patriotically engaged in “lawful efforts” to prostrate the freedom of the press and of speech. Truly, sir, the unworthiness of your object is somewhat relieved by the boldness of your attempt.

Now come to consider the latter part of this resolution in which “in a spirit of frankness, you advise such as may be concerned in a project of this description to abandon the attempt.” That this was intended for me, personally, you will not deny—as no other paper of the kind was proposed to be published here, and as I am the only person “concerned in the project” of publishing the Philanthropist. It would seem strange were it not so common—to see with what unvarying uniformity, one injudicious step impels, even, wise men to take others, that even the unlearned fairly pronounce to be silly. Having resolved that a “lawful” establishment shall be put down by “lawful efforts”—you next proceed, with all frankness, to “advise” me, with whom you had no personal acquaintance, and whom you had come together to anathematize. You seem to have forgotten even the common proprieties of life—and that, *advice* among equals, ought not under such circumstances to be tendered without solicitation. Really, sir, to one out of his minority some twenty years hence, this must appear like the very concrete of kind-

ness and care. We will proceed to test its sincerity and its claims to all praise, by taking an analogous case, in which you shall have all the advantage of this “advice” given “in a spirit of frankness.”

Suppose that, I, together with some fifty-seven (the number of names signed to your *call*) of my abolition friends in Cincinnati, take it into our heads, that John C. Wright, Esq., being a very able and experienced lawyer, is about to engage, for the purpose of bringing suit, in the investigation of a certain set of claims; the results of which we know will be—if he succeed in getting justice—that we, and many of our friends elsewhere, will be compelled to restore a great deal of ill-gotten gain to a vast number of needy widows and neglected orphans, and on which we and our abolition allies are now living in nabobical splendor—we lay our heads together, concocting a plan of this kind, that there shall be a fierce onset made by us of the newspapers as are in our interest and have the same stake with us;—they shall call you, “fanatic”—“incendiary”—“firebrand”—“organizer”—and almost every other name that can be found, tending to bring on you popular suspicion and indignation; we abuse all that may think well of you or your honorable effort, no matter how well their general conduct speaks for them; we alarm the weak, the ignorant, the indolent, the aristocratic, the capitalist, the merchant, the tradesmen, persuading them you intend to change in out, and out into in—up into down, and down into up; we say, it is absolutely necessary for the safety of the country [meaning by the country nothing more nor less than our honorable selves] that you be put down; finally we bring all together, “black spirits and white, blue spirits and grey,” into the very hell of justice as if to mock the cause to which it is sacred; a few of our most intemperate ring-leaders in this work of patriotism, make exciting and furious appeals to the crowd, and when we think they are strongest—*they*, declaring their will through the constitution of the state; or the slaveholders of the south, declaring theirs, through their willing coadjutors in our midst.

So with us: It is in Cincinnati, that the liberty of the press is disputed. It is there, that a pro-slavery aristocracy made up of “capitalists, merchants, and tradesmen, whose interests are linked in with the south,” has been arrayed against it—and it is there we intend to have it publicly demonstrated to the people of Ohio, which is strongest—*they*, declaring their will through the constitution of the state; or the slaveholders of the south, declaring theirs, through their willing coadjutors in our midst.

We commenced our paper *out* of the city—not with any intention of surrendering a right of which every individual, however humble, is made the keeper for his own and the common good—a trust which in our case, we think, no act of ours will ever bring into disonor; but that the character of our paper might be known throughout the country, that in this character there might not be found, even a plausible occasion for an outbreak against the public peace—and that, should such a disgrace be brought on our metropolis, no excuse should be found by its mobocratic and insurrectionary instigators. This part of our object is accomplished. The Philanthropist pervades the whole state—its character is known to multitudes of the freemen of Ohio and the United States. There is but one testimony returned to the editor by those who take it—and that, of approbation of the calm, and firm, yet impartial manner in which the agitating subject to which it is chiefly devoted, is treated, and of the fixed yet unimpassioned determination it exhibits to maintain the great principles, by which the blessings of liberty are now enjoyed by us and are to be transmitted to our children.

A few words to the two dough-face editors in Cincinnati—who, by a few months of humble drudgery in the cause of oppression, have won for themselves a notoriety, which none,—unless it be the wholesale executioners of the despots Nicholas can envy,—and which will be extinguished only by the growing accumulation of contempt which the awakened influence of truth and liberty will cast upon it:—to you we say, *be still, be still*—and there will be no disturbance of the public peace, or soil upon our city’s honorable fame. But if you will persist;—if, notwithstanding our earnest entreaty—our solemn expostulation, you will again rush to your task of summoning the disorderly to trample on the press—to overthrow the constitution, and to cover our unvarnished escutcheon with disgraceful stains—then on your heads be the guilt, and the shame and the scorn of disrobing your country, and exposing her, defiled and naked, to the world.

Anti-Slavery Intelligence.

[From the *Utica Standard and Democrat*.]

THEODORE D. WELD.—This distinguished philanthropist and unrivaled advocate for the abolition of slavery, is now delivering a course of lectures in this city. He commenced on Monday evening last, and will continue for several evenings to come. Every night he finds his audience greatly increased. The crowd has already become too great to be conveniently accommodated at the Bleeker street church, and the friends of human rights entertain the hope that the trustees of the first church will, ere long, open its doors to the people. They must be aware that such is the wish of a majority of that congregation.

Mr. Weld, in point of talent, in point of learning, in point of genius, and in point of zeal, in whatever he undertakes, is not excelled by any young man in the United States. Hence it is, that wherever he goes, the clamors of mobs are hushed in silence, the attention of the public is arrested and riveted to what he says, and the conviction of the truth of the doctrines he promulgates, is forced home upon the minds of the people. It is, of course, useless for us to urge the people to attend, the crowd is already too great, we repeat, to be conveniently accommodated until another place is provided. Yet, we would say to every one who can get a chance to hear, to go and listen to him.

To the dough-face editors of our own city do we especially recommend a careful consideration of these facts:

1. On the 21st day of October last a mob, led on by a member of Congress and a Judge, broke up, in this same city of Utica, the New York Anti-Slavery Convention, after, however, the constitution for a state anti-slavery society had been adopted. On this day, the mob seemed to be triumphant, and constitutions and laws overthrown.

2. On the 4th day of last January—in this same city of Utica, 60 young men, openly, in the Methodist church formed an anti-slavery society, and adopted spirited resolutions in favor of the supremacy of laws and the establishment of liberty.

3. On the 7th day of February, the “abolition incendiary” Theodore D. Weld, is speaking in behalf of laws and liberty, in the same city of Utica, to a crowd already become too great to be accommodated in the very identical church, from which the mob routed the anti-slavery convention,—and not a dough-face ventured to disturb.

Now, slipping the slaveholder’s harness, but for a moment, consider—are not these facts

If it should turn out to be an imposition on the publisher, it is to be hoped they may be successful in ferreting out the offender and bringing him to condign punishment. It was no doubt written for the purpose of increasing the existing excitement, and operating to the prejudice of the colored population by producing a sense of alarm, and inflaming the public mind. The destruction of the bank, gives it the appearance of a fiction, and we think so it will prove.

Since the foregoing was written, we understand that the publisher has offered a reward of one hundred dollars for the detection of the author of the letter.

The Cincinnati Gazette.

For the independent course taken by Mr. Hammond, at a time when the slaveholding influence, working through the dough-face prints of this city, seemed likely to overwhelm all that is precious to freemen among us—we render all honor. Whilst we freely do this—and whilst we are very sure, that no course which that editor may hereafter take, will lead us, in the smallest degree, to undervalue what he has done, we yet cannot pass unnoticed the wrong he is doing the abolitionists by such expressions as are to be found in his editorial remarks under the head of "Slave Market" in his paper of 25th ult. Speaking of the increased demand for slaves in the District of Columbia, our great slave market, and of the growing regularity of the traffic in human beings as carried on from the ports of that District with those of the south, he uses these words:

"Here the fanatic, general abolitionist may learn a lesson.—The rash, crude, and extravagantly fanatical movements of the anti-slavery societies have caused this revolution of sentiment—have lighted a flame which spurns the admonition of reason, and the demands of justice, and which half a century may not extinguish."

Now, if Mr. H. will take the trouble to make specifications of conduct on the part of abolitionists by which he thinks such expressions are warranted, abolitionists will no doubt be obliged to him. As it now stands, they think such generality of abuse, to be unjust; and on the part of Mr. H. especially, in a small degree, *inexcusable*. He is now asked, in terms of all due respect, either to desist in future from such vague, yet injurious expressions against a rapidly growing class of his fellow-citizens—or to produce facts, and from them to justify the coarseness of his invectives.

We claim nothing but what we believe to be *right*. In urging such a claim, we expect to be found no *respecter of persons*,—be they aristocratic or republican—whig or tory—rich or poor—learned or unlearned. What we claim from others, we will not be slow to *render* to others.

Arkansas.

The Arkansas Convention have framed a constitution, in anticipation of the admission of the territory into the confederacy of states. Mr. C. F. M. Noland has been appointed a messenger to carry the constitution to Washington city. We have glanced hastily at some of its provisions. The members of the lower branch of the legislature are to be chosen once in two years, and the members of the senate once in four; and the legislature is to have no power to pass laws for the emancipation of slaves without the consent of their owners.—*Louis. Jour.*

The information contained in the above article should excite every friend of freedom in our country to renewed exertion. The late action of the lower house of Congress in regard to the petitions for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia—and any action which may be anticipated on the same subject from the senate, leave scarcely a hope, but that our "field of blood" is to be formally enlarged and guarded by the sanctions of organic law from all intrusion on the part of religion, liberty, and mercy.

The constitution of Arkansas on which the Congress of the United States is called to judge whether she shall be admitted into the union or not, contains in a provision formally to perpetuate (for it amounts to nothing else) the most heartless and grinding system of oppression that has ever disgraced any country, and that is fast leading ours to a crisis of degradation, at which her worst enemies may rejoice.

George Thompson.

Our friend Thompson arrived, safe, in England, on the 4th of January. We rejoice to hear it, and wish not only for his sake, but theirs, that Mrs. T. and her little children [including his young George Washington] may soon be welcomed by their father, on their equally safe arrival. The following is an extract from his letter to Mr. Garrison:

Governor McDuffie's speech fills every one by whom it is perused, with horror and astonishment. If such sentiments were not found in *American* type, upon *American* paper, issued from public and unquestionable sources, they would scarcely gain credit in this country, so widely are they at variance with every principle of truth and justice, and so full are they of blasphemous imputations, and absurd perversions of the letter and spirit of the Bible. The legislature of a civilized state—a Christian people, and an enlightened world, gravely told by the highest executive officer of one of the republican states of North America, that "no human institution is more manifestly consistent with the will of God, than domestic slavery!" And again, "that domestic slavery, instead of being a political evil, is the corner-stone of your republican edifice!" Surely hell must have given nine cheers for Governor McDuffie.

Advertisements

FOR MEN ESCAPING FROM SLAVERY.

We noticed in the last Lexington Intelligencer what, we had supposed, we should never see in that print—an advertisement for a runaway slave. We were formerly under the impression, that such things were excluded from its columns. Would either of the editors engage in the business of *catching runaways*, for reward? We know, neither of them would. And yet what is the difference in principle, between the two cases,—of him who, for reward, gives the *clue* to overtake a *man* straining for his liberty,—and the "slave-catcher" who overtakes and returns him to aggravated and hopeless bondage. But if the Intelligencer, at the Pretorium of Kentucky-slavery deserves rebuke, what shall be said of *leading journals* in the free states which do the same thing? Surely such work ought not to be taken out of the hands of our dough-faces to whom it properly belongs.

Correction.

We were rather too fast, in saying a week or two ago, that the sole honor of returning our paper with abusive language written on the margin, was due to an editor at Nashville, professing to publish a *religious* newspaper. Since then, a competitor, the editor of the *South Carolina Times*, at Columbia, has put in his claims to this honor.

He returned our first number with the "pictorial" of a gallows and a man suspended from it, on the margin immediately over our name, with this superscription—"wishing you may soon be an *upright man*." Our second number was returned with the same "pictorial," the

superscription being changed thus—"wishing you a speedy elevation to the place you deserve."

We have also received a few abusive letters, which carry with them such decisive internal evidence of the vulgarity and ignorance of the writers, that we do not wish to take any further notice of them. It may perhaps, be the means of stopping them entirely, for such persons to be informed, that the post-master at New Richmond does not exact from us the postage—on such papers. So if to charge us with the postage be their object, they will not effect it.

Trouble in the Wigwam.

MR. PINCKNEY of South Carolina introduced the resolution into the House of Representatives in Congress, by which that House was excused from saying, that Congress had no power under the constitution to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia. For this, Mr. Wise, of Virginia, who seems to be a genuine Drawcansir, said in a speech, "I spurn and hiss at him [Mr. P.] as a deserter from the principles of the south."

Ohio Anti-Slavery Anniversary.

Is it not time some arrangements were making for holding—say in April,—the first anniversary of the Ohio Anti-Slavery Society?

Anti-Slavery Societies.

THERE are now more than **FOUR HUNDRED** anti-slavery societies auxiliary to the American Anti-Slavery Society.

ANTI-SLAVERY PUBLICATIONS—may be had by neighboring societies, by making application to any of the following gentlemen, officers or members of the Board of Managers of the Cincinnati Anti-Slavery Society:—James C. Ludlow, Isaac Colby, William T. Truman, James G. Birney, Gamaliel Bailey, Jr., William Donaldson, John Melendy, F. A. Sayre, C. Donaldson, M. R. Robinson, Rees E. Price, Benjamin Bassett, J. C. Clopper, A. Hopkins, Thomas Maylin, or William Holyoke.

PERSONS in Cincinnati wishing to subscribe for the Philanthropist may leave their names with any of the following gentlemen:—C. Donaldson & Co., Main street—A. Kellogg, Fifth street—John Melendy, Main street, near Corporation Line—William Holyoke, Sycamore street—Dr. Isaac Colby, Broadway—or Dr. Gamaliel Bailey, Fifth street, between Race and Elm.

Editorial Correspondence.

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.—*From a slave state*—and from one who is *not an abolitionist*.—

"I wish those Cincinnati editors could know the estimate in which they are held among the people, whose favor they imagine they are getting by their servile course. Even slaveholders feel towards them as Philip of Macedon is said to have felt towards the orators of Greece, whom he had bribed to gull the people into a surrender of their liberties—he loved the treason, but despised the traitors."

4. Resolved, That this General Assembly would regard any act of Congress, having for its object the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia or the territories of the United States, as having just cause of alarm to the slaveholding states, and bringing the union into imminent peril.—Ayes 122; noes 4.

5. Resolved, That it is highly expedient for the slaveholding states, to enact such laws and regulations as may be necessary to suppress and prevent the circulation of any incendiary publication within their respective limits.—Unanimous.

6. Resolved, That confiding in the justice and loyalty of our northern brethren to the principles of the Union, enforced by the sympathies of common dangers, sufferings and triumphs, which ought to bind us together in fraternal concord, we are warranted in the expectation, that the foregoing requests will be received in the spirit in which they are made, and complied with.—Ayes 125; noes 1.

7. Resolved, That Congress has no constitutional power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, or in the Territories of the United States.—Ayes 105; noes 13.

8. Resolved, That the Governor be, and he is hereby requested to forward a copy of these resolutions to each of our senators and representatives in Congress, and to the executive of each of the states of the union, with a request that the same may be submitted to their respective legislatures.

progress of abolitionism as the whips and chains of Xerxes did to tranquilize the naught waves of the Hellespont.—*Emancipator*.

From the Richmond Compiler, Jan. 21.

THE ABOLITION QUESTION SETTLED.

About 6 o'clock yesterday evening, the House of Delegates got through the perplexing question of the last ten days. We have not room to give the details nor are they very important at this moment. As general a concurrence has been attained on the resolutions as could possibly have been expected, after the contrariety of opinion which for a while prevailed. We never doubted the decisive character of the final action of the House, when disenthralled of those extraneous considerations which will, despite of a better judgment, sometimes obtrude themselves.

1. Resolved. That this commonwealth only has the right to control or interfere with the subject of domestic slavery, within its limits, and that these rights will be maintained at all hazards.—Unanimous.

2. Resolved, That the state of Virginia has a right to claim prompt and efficient legislation by her co-states, to restrain, as far as practicable, and to punish those of their citizens who, in defiance of the obligations of social duty and the constitution, assail her safety and tranquility, by forming associations for the abolition of slavery, or printing, publishing or circulating through the mail or otherwise, seditious and incendiary publications, and that this right, founded as it is on the principles of international law, is peculiarly fortified by a just consideration of the intimate and sacred relations that exist between the states of this Union.—Ayes, 108, noes, 7.

3. Resolved, That the non-slaveholding states of the union are respectively, but earnestly requested promptly to adopt penal enactments, or such other measures as will effectually suppress all associations within their respective limits, purporting to be or having the character of abolition societies; and that they will make it penal to print, publish or distribute newspapers, pamphlets, or other publications calculated or having a tendency to excite the slaves of the southern states to insurrection and revolt.—Ayes 125; noes 1.

4. Resolved, That this General Assembly would regard any act of Congress, having for its object the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia or the territories of the United States, as having just cause of alarm to the slaveholding states, and bringing the union into imminent peril.—Ayes 122; noes 4.

5. Resolved, That it is highly expedient for the slaveholding states, to enact such laws and regulations as may be necessary to suppress and prevent the circulation of any incendiary publication within their respective limits.—Unanimous.

6. Resolved, That confiding in the justice and loyalty of our northern brethren to the principles of the Union, enforced by the sympathies of common dangers, sufferings and triumphs, which ought to bind us together in fraternal concord, we are warranted in the expectation, that the foregoing requests will be received in the spirit in which they are made, and complied with.—Ayes 125; noes 1.

7. Resolved, That Congress has no constitutional power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, or in the Territories of the United States.—Ayes 105; noes 13.

8. Resolved, That the Governor be, and he is hereby requested to forward a copy of these resolutions to each of our senators and representatives in Congress, and to the executive of each of the states of the union, with a request that the same may be submitted to their respective legislatures.

9. Resolved, That it is highly expedient for the slaveholding states, to enact such laws and regulations as may be necessary to suppress and prevent the circulation of any incendiary publication within their respective limits.—Unanimous.

10. Resolved, That confiding in the justice and loyalty of our northern brethren to the principles of the Union, enforced by the sympathies of common dangers, sufferings and triumphs, which ought to bind us together in fraternal concord, we are warranted in the expectation, that the foregoing requests will be received in the spirit in which they are made, and complied with.—Ayes 125; noes 1.

11. Resolved, That Congress has no constitutional power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, or in the Territories of the United States.—Ayes 105; noes 13.

12. Resolved, That the Governor be, and he is hereby requested to forward a copy of these resolutions to each of our senators and representatives in Congress, and to the executive of each of the states of the union, with a request that the same may be submitted to their respective legislatures.

13. Resolved, That it is highly expedient for the slaveholding states, to enact such laws and regulations as may be necessary to suppress and prevent the circulation of any incendiary publication within their respective limits.—Unanimous.

14. Resolved, That confiding in the justice and loyalty of our northern brethren to the principles of the Union, enforced by the sympathies of common dangers, sufferings and triumphs, which ought to bind us together in fraternal concord, we are warranted in the expectation, that the foregoing requests will be received in the spirit in which they are made, and complied with.—Ayes 125; noes 1.

15. Resolved, That it is highly expedient for the slaveholding states, to enact such laws and regulations as may be necessary to suppress and prevent the circulation of any incendiary publication within their respective limits.—Unanimous.

16. Resolved, That confiding in the justice and loyalty of our northern brethren to the principles of the Union, enforced by the sympathies of common dangers, sufferings and triumphs, which ought to bind us together in fraternal concord, we are warranted in the expectation, that the foregoing requests will be received in the spirit in which they are made, and complied with.—Ayes 125; noes 1.

17. Resolved, That it is highly expedient for the slaveholding states, to enact such laws and regulations as may be necessary to suppress and prevent the circulation of any incendiary publication within their respective limits.—Unanimous.

18. Resolved, That confiding in the justice and loyalty of our northern brethren to the principles of the Union, enforced by the sympathies of common dangers, sufferings and triumphs, which ought to bind us together in fraternal concord, we are warranted in the expectation, that the foregoing requests will be received in the spirit in which they are made, and complied with.—Ayes 125; noes 1.

19. Resolved, That it is highly expedient for the slaveholding states, to enact such laws and regulations as may be necessary to suppress and prevent the circulation of any incendiary publication within their respective limits.—Unanimous.

20. Resolved, That confiding in the justice and loyalty of our northern brethren to the principles of the Union, enforced by the sympathies of common dangers, sufferings and triumphs, which ought to bind us together in fraternal concord, we are warranted in the expectation, that the foregoing requests will be received in the spirit in which they are made, and complied with.—Ayes 125; noes 1.

21. Resolved, That it is highly expedient for the slaveholding states, to enact such laws and regulations as may be necessary to suppress and prevent the circulation of any incendiary publication within their respective limits.—Unanimous.

22. Resolved, That confiding in the justice and loyalty of our northern brethren to the principles of the Union, enforced by the sympathies of common dangers, sufferings and triumphs, which ought to bind us together in fraternal concord, we are warranted in the expectation, that the foregoing requests will be received in the spirit in which they are made, and complied with.—Ayes 125; noes 1.

23. Resolved, That it is highly expedient for the slaveholding states, to enact such laws and regulations as may be necessary to suppress and prevent the circulation of any incendiary publication within their respective limits.—Unanimous.

24. Resolved, That confiding in the justice and loyalty of our northern brethren to the principles of the Union, enforced by the sympathies of common dangers, sufferings and triumphs, which ought to bind us together in fraternal concord, we are warranted in the expectation, that the foregoing requests will be received in the spirit in which they are made, and complied with.—Ayes 125; noes 1.

25. Resolved, That it is highly expedient for the slaveholding states, to enact such laws and regulations as may be necessary to suppress and prevent the circulation of any incendiary publication within their respective limits.—Unanimous.

26. Resolved, That confiding in the justice and loyalty of our northern brethren to the principles of the Union, enforced by the sympathies of common dangers, sufferings and triumphs, which ought to bind us together in fraternal concord, we are warranted in the expectation, that the foregoing requests will be received in the spirit in which they are made, and complied with.—Ayes 125; noes 1.

27. Resolved, That it is highly expedient for the slaveholding states, to enact such laws and regulations as may be necessary to suppress and prevent the circulation of any incendiary publication within their respective limits.—Unanimous.

28. Resolved, That confiding in the justice and loyalty of our northern brethren to the principles of the Union, enforced by the sympathies of common dangers, sufferings and triumphs, which ought to bind us together in fraternal concord, we are warranted in the expectation, that the foregoing requests will be received in the spirit in which they are made, and complied with.—Ayes 125; noes 1.

29. Resolved, That it is highly expedient for the slaveholding states, to enact such laws and regulations as may be necessary to suppress and prevent the circulation of any incendiary publication within their respective limits.—Unanimous.

30. Resolved, That confiding in the justice and loyalty of our northern brethren to the principles of the Union, enforced by the sympathies of common dangers, sufferings and triumphs, which ought to bind us together in fraternal concord, we are warranted in the expectation, that the foregoing requests will be received in the spirit in which they are made, and complied with.—Ayes 125; noes 1.

31. Resolved, That it is highly expedient for the slaveholding states, to enact such laws and regulations as may be necessary to suppress and prevent the circulation of any incendiary publication within their respective limits.—Unanimous.

32. Resolved, That confiding in the justice and loyalty of our northern brethren to the principles of the Union, enforced by the sympathies of common dangers, sufferings and triumphs, which ought to bind us together in fraternal concord, we are warranted in the expectation, that the foregoing requests will be received in the spirit in which they are made, and complied with.—Ayes 125; noes 1.

33. Resolved, That it is highly expedient for the slaveholding states, to enact such laws and regulations as may be necessary to suppress and prevent the circulation of any incendiary publication within their respective limits.—Unanimous.

34. Resolved, That confiding in the justice and loyalty of our northern brethren to the principles of the Union, enforced by the sympathies of common dangers, sufferings and triumphs, which ought to bind us together in fraternal concord, we are warranted in the expectation, that the foregoing requests will be received in the spirit in which they are made, and complied with.—Ayes 125; noes 1.

ing the right of property guaranteed by the constitution of the United States, and endangering the lives of our citizens; and we do earnestly recommend to all judges and magistrates, and the police of every city, town, and corporation, to use unceasing vigilance and increased energy in the detection of all fanatical emissaries, and in the suppression of their nefarious schemes and publications; and we do moreover respectfully request the legislature of this commonwealth to take into consideration the existing laws against writing or printing books, pamphlets, or other writings, advising or encouraging insurrection, and the circulation of all such documents, and to enact such further laws on the subject, with increased penalties, as shall more effectually suppress the circulation of all such incendiary matter, and to provide means for carrying all such laws into effect, by giving suitable rewards for the detection and apprehension of offenders.

JAMES G. FICKLIN, Foreman.

A copy—Teste, J. KEAN, Clk.

"We, the grand jury, duly summoned to attend the circuit court of law and chancery held for the

POETRY.

The African Slave.

ADDRESSING HIS UNFELING MASTER AT THE TIME OF LEAVING HIS NATIVE COUNTRY.

BIND fast these hands—these feet confine;
Tell me I am not free;
From kindred, country, all that's mine,
Transport me o'er the sea;
In yonder mart of trafficking,
Where beasts are bought and sold,
There sell me, a poor African—
There barter me for gold!

Degrade me to the stupid beast,
That knows no right or wrong;
To man, though classed among the least,
Deny that I belong;
Say that I have no heart but steel—
No free born rights to loose—
No soul, my injured wrongs to feel—
No better part to choose.

Do this, and then to church repair!—
Assume the Christian name;
And to thy God prefer thy prayer,
Devoid of fear or shame;
Reach forth thy hand to take the cup,
Salvation hath enjoined;
Like Judas! with the Saviour sup,
With an unhallowed mind!

But know, thy God was never known,—
The God of peace and love;
He never can thy spirit own
In the blest courts above.
Thy god is this world's sordid gain,
And soon will leave thee drear;
When racked with some distracting pain,
Thou shalt not find Him near.

There is a day approaching fast,
(It lies beyond the grave)
When righteous judgment will be passed
On tyrant and on slave;
To him who hath no mercy known,
No mercy will be given;
While he who hath kind pity shown,
Shall find a place in heaven.

I bow, since thou will not repent—
Nor longer for me wait;
Since thy stern heart cannot relent,
I yield me to thy fate;
In distant lands unknown to me,
Without one pitying friend,
Drudged out in slavey slavery,
My wretched life shall end.

When each long sultry day is past,
My weary task to close,
And dew-drops gently falling fast,
Invite me to repose;
I'll lie me to some lonely spot,
Where footstep ne'er have trod,
And there, by all mankind forgot,
Will raise my soul to God.

I may not, shall not be denied
The soul-sustaining grace
Of Him who hath on Calvary died,
For all the human race.

I'll in that lone, sequestered shade,
Pour forth that briny flood
To Him who hath in wisdom made
"All nations of one blood."—*Liberator.*

ANTI-SLAVERY INTELLIGENCE.

The West Indies.

It is certainly a cheering thing to the philanthropist and Christian, to see how God, in his providence, blesses the performance of duty. This is beginning to be remarkably demonstrated in the West Indies, as will be seen by the following articles from the New York Evangelist. We entertain no doubt that the same result, though in a much greater degree, would be witnessed in the southern states if they would obey the mandate—"let the oppressed go free."

In addition to the cheering article in another column, we have the testimony of an esteemed friend, an intelligent merchant in New England, at this moment sitting by our table, and who has just returned from a residence of fifteen months in the West Indies, and who assures us that the anticipations of the friends of freedom have been more than realized, and all the foreboding of the pro-slavery party are now laughed at.

LATEST FROM THE WEST INDIES.—An observing correspondent of the Journal of Commerce has visited several of the Islands where slavery was abolished on the first of August, 1834, and his report is more favorable than any previous account. In Barbados, he says, after a residence of three months, "that there is, since August, 1834, an appreciation of real estate; that the quantity of the crop is equal, and the cost and trouble of working estates is not increased."

From Antigua, the report is still more favorable, as will be seen by the letter.

Antigua, 10th Jan. 1836.

We arrived at this charming island a day or two since. Its harbor, or St. John's harbor, is safe when once in it, but rather difficult of access. We could not but remark how superior this seemed in verdure and in culture to the other islands where we have touched. The legislature of this colony, instead of accepting the apprenticeship system as was done in the other dependencies, set the slaves free altogether. Of course we felt much solicitude to know how their plan worked. What we saw with our own eyes was highly favorable. The testimony of the inhabitants accorded with it. By their account, there was no difficulty in procuring labor at one shilling per day and most persons think this cheaper than slave labor. One of the criteria is the price of property, and I was informed that real estate is changing hands briskly at an advance on former rates.

A clergyman connected with the army remarked to me that it was pretty generally conceded, that the \$100,000,000 granted as a compensation to the slaveholders here, was an equivalent to a free gift; the value of the property not being diminished. I have met with but one gentleman, and he was a member of the council for Trinidad, who did not admit that property was rising in value from some cause or other. Some attribute it to the abundance of money in consequence of loans to the colonies and the compensation fund; others, to the high price of the colonial produce; and others to the new system, or all combined. I will not pretend to theorize on this subject. I give the facts as they appear after eighteen months experience. I have always been opposed to the schemes of abolitionists in our country, and still think the acts of the British government, gross violations of contracts; yet I trust that wherever truth leads, I shall be willing to follow. Certain facts I consider established.

1st. That labor can be obtained at reasonable rates.

I infer this from the fact that the desire of the comforts and necessities of life induces the colored people to seek employment, and that when task-work is given them it is performed cheaper under the free law, but let the right remain sacred.

2d. That in view of the apprentice system properties have appreciated. Many speculators have considered estates here good and safe investments.

The sugar crop throughout the ten islands where we have been is remarkably promising. In the French islands a desire was expressed that war might take place with us, with the expectation, I suppose, that their ports would see some rich prizes. The French Admiral, with one ship of war, has arrived at Guadalupe.

NORTHERN SPIRIT.

Public Sentiment—Cincinnati Resolutions.

PRO-SLAVERY MEETING.—A meeting has been held in Cincinnati of those opposed to anti-slavery measures, which on account of the principles advanced and the standing and character of the men who took a leading part in its proceedings and deliberations, deserved more than a passing notice. When such men as Jacob Burnett, John C. Wright, Robert T. Lytle and others, lend the sanction of their names and influence to principles, like those contained in resolutions passed at this meeting, principles utterly subversive of the rights of men and totally at war with the genius of our government, it is time for the people to begin to search into the cause of the evil which is so fast driving from them the fundamental principles of liberty, and lay to their united efforts, that this cause may be removed before utter ruin shall overtake them.

The first resolution passed at this meeting which we shall notice, is the following:

Resolved., That we coincide fully, in the enlightened views taken by the governor of New York in his late message, on this subject, and believe with him, that if in defiance of the well known established popular sentiment, to sustain in its purity the integrity of the federal compact, these "misguided men" continue to pursue a course, at war with the same, that we will join in recommending the prompt and efficient legislation of this state, in conjunction with the other members of the confederacy, to arrest their designs, and thereby sustain the original compact, which made us a *united people*."

Here is a plain declaration, that if the friends of the slave at the north, "continue" to proclaim the doctrines contained in the Declaration of our Independence "that all men are born free and equal," &c.; if they "continue" to maintain, that men ought to cease from doing unto others as they would not be done unto; if they "continue" to declare that to rob a man of himself, his wife and children, and all the fruits of his daily labor is a heinous sin against God and a violation of his most sacred commandments; if they "continue" to serve God according to the dictates of their own consciences and his word by reproving sin, and endeavoring to persuade men to turn from their evil ways and pursue righteousness; if they "continue" to do these things by the fearless exercise of the rights bestowed upon them by their Maker and secured to them by the constitution under which they live, then the arm of the law is to be upraised to sweep away their rights with the besom of destruction, and reduce them to the condition of slaves that the chains which now bind more than two millions of our fellow creatures in this land where naught but freedom dwells, may be drawn with a more galling effect around those already ground into the dust by their iron hearted oppressors! It never can, it never will be done! Selfish politicians, may join in recommending, but no legislature, will be found sufficiently depraved to lay the constitution prostrate and bleeding before them and take away the rights of their constituents for the purpose of perpetuating slavery. And even should this be done, it would raise a commotion, which would shake society to its centre. The frens of the north, would begin to flock around the standard of liberty. They would guard the citadel of their rights, and would not fail to hold slavery responsible as the enemy which had made an assault upon the sanctuary of their dearest idol, and never would lay off their armor until with a high hand and a strong arm they had placed their foot upon the neck of their foe and slain the greatest despot upon human rights.

But this is not the only exceptional resolution passed at this meeting. The following proclaims, fully, the doctrine that men who have a colored skin are subjects for property. That the slaveholder has a right of property in his slave. Which right is not created by the law, but a previously existing right merely secured to them by the constitution and laws of the land.

Resolved., That in the opinion of this meeting, it is not expedient for Congress to adopt a course of legislation for the District of Columbia by which the citizens thereof will be deprived of the right of property in their slaves, which right we believe is secured to them by the constitution and laws of the land."

Here then it is plainly asserted, that the slaveholders in the District of Columbia have a right of property in their slaves. That that right is secured to them by the constitution and laws of the United States, and that it is inexpedient for Congress to deprive the citizens of the District of Columbia by the constitution, then Congress has no right to abolish slavery in the District; and why say "it is not expedient?" Why not come out boldly and say that it has not the right to do it. The reason is obvious. Nine-tenths of the people at the north believe that Congress have the right to abolish slavery in the District, and the politicians who were the leaders of this meeting, would not hazard their standing by denying that right, but content themselves by declaring it inexpedient to use it, at the same time endeavoring to satisfy the south by declaring that slavery is guaranteed by the constitution of the United States, the right to hold property in slaves is secured to the citizens of the District of Columbia. There is no such clause. No such security is given. The constitution of the United States is a plain instrument. The people can read it and judge for themselves.

We'll notice only one more resolution. It is what may be called the mob-exciting and mob-pleasing resolution evidently inserted as a scare-crow to those who are endeavoring to spread the blessings of freedom. These men are not to be deterred by threats of danger.

It is strange that northern men should endeavor to blind the eyes of the people of the south by such false representations in regard to the number of those engaged in anti-slavery measures. The time has gone by when their number was insignificant. Thousands are now acting with them, and their number is daily increasing.

Resolved., That fully impressed as we are with the insignificance, as regards numbers, of the abolitionists of the west, and aware of the excited and provoked feelings of the great mass of our fellow-citizens opposed to our views, we consider it our duty to warn these deluded men, of the odium they are incurring, in persevering in their weak and vain struggles for an object impracticable and unattainable."—*Ohio Atlas.*

Beaver County, Pa., Anti-Slavery Meeting.

RESOLVED., That the right of free discussion is the birthright of man—guaranteed to every American citizen, by the constitution of his country—consequently, it cannot be taken from him, or abridged by any power whatsoever.

Resolved., That as the U. S. mail and post-office

were established for the good of the whole nation, therefore, the abolitionists have the same right as any other body of men to use it. If they violate their rights, let them be dealt with according to law, but let the right remain sacred.

Resolved., That we view with alarm, the impunity with which officers high in trust, have violated the law of our country; in wresting from innocent citizens, rights, which are secured to them by government—thus undermining the security and confidence of the people in our republican institutions.

Resolved., That every man who joins a mob is a traitor to his country, and by so doing lends his influence to the introduction of anarchy and the demotion of our federal constitution.

Resolved., That slaveholders are agitators, and their doctrines incendiary, producing mobs, lawless violence, destruction of property by fire, judgment and death, without trial by jury—insanity and alarm, by offering rewards for the abduction of American citizens who have broken no law, and are convicted of no crime.

Resolved., That the charges made against abolitionists by the president of the U. States, and governors of different states, are entirely unsupported by evidence; consequently we look upon the abolitionists as an innocent, injured and persecuted class of citizens, and feel called upon to aid in maintaining their rights, and vindicating their character before the nations and the world.

Resolved., That as liberty and slavery cannot exist in the same country, under the same laws, without the destruction of one or the other—we therefore feel called upon as friends of liberty, to give our united testimony in her favor, and also to embody our influence against oppression, by forming an Anti-Slavery Society.

After the above resolutions were adopted, the following preamble to a constitution was presented and accepted, and the officers elected for the ensuing year.

PREAMBLE.

Whereas, In the principles of liberty are freedom and equality of rights—and as color, condition of birth, poverty, ignorance, deformity, or any other peculiarity or misfortune, cannot affect these rights, we therefore regard it not only as a glaring inconsistency, but a flagrant violation of justice, for republicans to seize those whom Providence has so circumstanced as to render unable to defend themselves or protect their families, and strip them of their all—drag them down to the mean level of a chattel—turning them into articles of merchandise, or mere tools to be used for the convenience of the master, thus striking them out of existence as beings possessing rights and susceptibilities of happiness.

We raise our voice against this crying injustice, and strive to obey the command, "thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbor, and not suffer sin upon him."

Further—the tone assumed on this subject by the wrong-doers is fearfully portentous, and demands the immediate rebuke of freemen. When remonstrated with, and asked by what right they hold these men as property? They "point to their swords and scorn any other reply." We may be the sufferers next, and this summary logic silence our demands for justice. Believing then, as we do, that slavery is the foster-mother of oppression, and the most ferocious enemy of civil liberty, we will use our influence to bring about its speedy abolition.

MISCELLANEOUS.

"Southern Chivalry."

By nothing have the free states been more befooled than the notion of "southern chivalry." Multitudes are persuaded, that a southern climate and habits of slave-domination have a marvellous efficacy in converting all who have the good fortune to be exposed to their salutary influence, into Crichtons, and Bayards, and Orlandos'. Such reason altogether unphilosophical, and the facts show it. Whilst many of the planters, of age, sobriety and standing, entertain right views as to the chivalry prevailing there, it is very certain, that with the young, the idle, the dissipated and the politically ambitious, it is excessive.

The morbid sensibility prevailing in slave states—and proportioned, too, pretty accurately, to the aggravation of slavery—is actually astonishing. An instance of it: Three years ago, the firm of _____ in New Orleans, had two young men in their employment as clerks. A gentleman, passing by the counting room, stepped in and enquired if the mail had arrived? One of the young men answered yes. The gentleman went on his way. The other clerk said without any intention, apparent in his manner, of insulting the first, that the mail had not arrived. This produced a re-affirmation on the other part. Mutual contradictions grew fierce—honors were wounded—and southern chivalry called the young men (for they were quite young) to the field. At the first discharge of pistols, one of them was wounded very badly in the ankle. His uncle, who was one of the firm, examined the wound to see if his nephew could stand up to renew the fight; declaring he should fight on, if he could stand. However, the young man was too much disabled and the affair ended here.

Both members of the firm, by which these young men were employed—men of age, and of respectable character, according to the *New Orleans Standard*, were present, one on each side, urging on this disgraceful and vile work.

Of all sorts of chivalry, whether of the dark ages or of present times, we have entertained for many years a very poor opinion—because they were opposed to common sense and religion. But that, which publishes its recommendations in lawless violence on defenceless strangers, in whippings, and executions, in the prostration of all law, in a determination to persist in oppression, and in preying on its own caste, in the absence of other nourishment, we hold an utter abhorrence. This is southern chivalry—and of its claim to favor we have in the following article, fresh and indubitable evidence.

Raymond, Miss. *January 13, 1836.*—The state of things in this community is very peculiar. Wealth, land, negroes and cotton bales, and politics form the grand and all-absorbing considerations; and hence, impetuosity and warmth of temperament are strikingly manifest among all ranks and conditions of men. A brother told me that at Vicksburg, on Christmas evening, he saw a man brought into the tavern drearily gashed and cut in a dirk fight he had; and that during the night, he heard the report of a pistol, and next morning a man was found in the street with a large ball and five buck shot holes in his breast. On Monday last, the streets of Clinton were unusually thronged with men, and on enquiry I was informed that two men were momentarily expected to meet and commence shooting at each other. During the evening one of them shot the other, but without doing any injury. Next morning I left soon after daylight, in the stage: when about one quarter of a mile out of town, I passed two parties just preparing for a duel, which soon after took place between Judge Caldwell and Mr. Gwinn, receiver of public monies. They were placed sixty yards from each other, with four pistols each, and they approached and fired at each other at pleasure; six or seven shots passed—Caldwell had one arm shot to pieces, and another ball passed through his bowels, while Gwinn had a shot in his breast which passed

directly through his body. Caldwell is dead, and Gwinn yet lingers. At the tavern where I stayed on Monday night, in Clinton, one man, on undressing exhibited eight pistols, and another six, besides a large knife, two inches broad and fifteen inches long. But enough of this.

CRUDITY.

The following essay taken from the Cincinnati Gazette, occasioned us a little doubt, at the first reading;—we scarcely knew whether the writer intended it in earnest or in joke. Another gentleman, we know, has put it down for the latter. However, there is in it, to our view, too much of the sincerity and simplicity of ignorance for this construction to be put on it. However, be this as it may, if it is intended for irony, the intention is too deeply hidden; if for good earnest, it well deserves the head to which we have attached it.

Mr. Hammond—I perceive in your paper of Thursday, an article upon slavery, copied from a New York paper, which I hope will prove a warning to the abolitionists, inasmuch as it shows an increase of the slave business since their ill-directed efforts commenced, and, evidently, in consequence of those efforts. Every new proceeding of the abolitionists is set down, not in black and white, but in black, blue, and red, upon the back of the slave. And here, I suppose, those who are the cause of it, will exclaim at what they are pleased to call the barbarity of the master, when it is but an act of necessity, to save his slaves from murdering him and his family; severe, it is true, but still necessary, and made so by these very abolitionists, who pretend to be the friends of the slave. I repeat, they make it necessary; for every meeting they hold on the subject, every pamphlet they print, make the slave more restless and troublesome; which evils must, of course, be put down. If the slaves are let alone as they are, and no more attempts made to free them, it will be much to their advantage; they will lose all thoughts of rising up against their masters; their masters would become kind and indulgent, and the lot of the slave in this country would be nearly as comfortable as the lower class of people, even in the United States, and fully as much as those of the old countries. Witness the condition of the foreigners who are every day arriving on our shores—look at them, and then at the slave in the south; half these emigrants do not know where their next mouthful of bread is to come from or when; the slave has no such fears; he looks forward with happiness to the close of the day, and has no cares for the morrow; he is satisfied with his food and clothing, which are better than he could provide if he were free; and, as they look up to the white man as a superior being, (and surely he is,) it is only when they hear of some meeting of those superior beings at which the miseries of the "poor slave" are discussed, that they are in the least dissatisfied.

Some persons have proposed to educate the slave. This will never do—it will not free them, and consequently can only make them more miserable than the abolitionists are in a fair way to make them. At present they know nothing about the rights of man, and all that, and are therefore more contented than they would be if they did. "Where ignorance is happiness, it is folly to be wise."

In fact, the inferiority of the African negro almost makes one lean to the belief of some, that he was intended to be a slave. At any rate, he has need of some body to take care of him, and while he gets a master who makes him as comfortable as the lower classes of the whites in the largest part of the world, he certainly has no cause to complain. The slave, if he disobeys his master, receives chastisement—a few blows only; over in the old countries, if a poor man does contrary to the wish of his lord, he does not receive a whipping, it is true, but he is flogged heels over head out of his house, with his whole family, to perish. Which is the worst?

And if the abolitionists wish to see the lot of the slave, let them go to the master, and talk to him about setting his slaves free. Oh no!—they know better than that—they keep out of the way themselves, but send pictures calculated to inflame the slave, where he can see them—and he becomes irritated to kill his master, and as many more of the whites as he can. Pretty times, indeed, when white people have more feeling for black—screaming beings that are human—than they have for people of their own color, and of their own country!

Which had better be, the negro a slave, with some little trouble, or that the white men be murdered, and their houses burned? Whether three millions of blacks, or six millions of whites have to suffer? Shall three millions of negroes be the cause of the dissolution of this union? Such will, certainly, be the consequence